

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/750,799	01/02/2004	Bradley R. Corral	082669045008	1828
28104	7590 06/14/2004		EXAMINER	
JONES DAY			DURAND, PAUL R	
77 WEST WA	CKER L 60601-1692		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	- 1 2 11 11 N	A!!			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/750,799	CORRAL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
•	Paul Durand	3721			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by set any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinn. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron statute. cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
•	This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for all	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the applicat 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the control of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the or the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Someotion is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Statement No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/04. 	B) Paper No(s)/Mail D B/08) 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Pate Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (US 4,625,635) in view of Cleine et al (US 5,282,347).

In regard to claim 1, Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a banding system comprised of supports 26 and 30, strapping machine in the form of feed mechanism 34 and 34a, which feed the banding material into guide elements in the form of tracks 40, which are movable from a first position where it is engaged with the band 36 and a second position, where it is disengaged from the band (see Figs.1-3, C1,L43-63 and C2,L29-51). What Lewis does not disclose is the use of a delivering mechanism that transports the load to be banded. However, Cleine teaches that it is old and well known in the art of banding to provide a trolley 44, which rides on rails and is used to transport load 46 to a banding machine for the purpose of efficiently transporting and wrapping a load (see Figs. 1,4 and C4,L41-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the banding machine of Lewis with the delivery mechanism of Cleine for the purpose of efficiently transporting and wrapping a load.

Art Unit: 3721

In regard to claim 2, Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a guide element comprised of track 40 that is "C" shaped (see Figs 1 and 2).

In regard to claim 3, Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a pair of spring biased jaws 42 (see Fig. 4).

In regard to claims 4 and 5, the modified invention of Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a rail operated delivery system. What the modified invention of Lewis does not disclose is the use of a sprocket and chain conveyor to transport the load to and from the banding machine. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of conveying to provide a sprocket and chain operated conveyor as an alternative means to convey a product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified banding machine of Lewis with the delivery mechanism comprised of a sprocket and chain for the purpose of transporting a product

In regard to claim 6, Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a band 36, which is dispensed and retrieved horizontally from the banding area (see Figs. 1 and 2).

3. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis in view of Cleine et al as applied to claims 1-4 and in further view of Mitanihara et al (US 4,836,873).

The modified invention of Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied to claim 1 above except for the use of a heat sealing mechanism to seal the

Art Unit: 3721

band together. However, Mitanihara teaches that it is old and well known in the art of banding to provide a heating mechanism 16, which heat seals the band for the purpose of reducing material banding costs by using plastic banding material (see Fig. 5 and CC3,L6-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified banding machine of Lewis with the heats sealing mechanism as taught by Mitanihara for the purpose of reducing material banding costs by using plastic banding material.

Further regarding claim 8, the modified invention of Lewis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a rail operated delivery system. What the modified invention of Lewis does not disclose is the use of a sprocket and chain conveyor to transport the load to and from the banding machine. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art of conveying to provide a sprocket and chain operated conveyor as an alternative means to convey a product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided the modified banding machine of Lewis with the delivery mechanism comprised of a sprocket and chain for the purpose of transporting a product.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Neitzel, Bricmont, Cleine, Lai and Kimmerle have been cited to show devices having similar structure..

Art Unit: 3721

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Durand whose telephone number is 703-305-4962. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I Rada can be reached on 703-308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Durand June 8, 2004

SCOTT A. SMITH PRIMARY EXAMINER